DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 572 HE 006 987

AUTHOR	Phelan, Daniel J.
TITLE	Faculty, Student and Staff Attitudes Toward Potential Collective Bargaining Issues at the Ohio State University. Research Summary No. 3.
INSTITUTION	Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Oct 75
NOTE	17p.; Summary of Master's thesis, The Ohio State University
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Collective Bargaining; *Decision Making; Fringe Benefits; Grievance Procedures; *Higher Education; Interprofessional Relationship; Strikes; *Student Attitudes; Student Participation; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation; Unions
IDENTIFIERS	Columbia; Ohio State University

ABSTRACT

Attitudes concerning faculty unionization have an impact on its rejection or acceptance and its subsequent implementation. This study was conducted to determine the level of agreement among faculty, student services staff, and students before major collective bargaining activities, such as a run-off election, take place. Assessed are attitudes held by faculty, students who are active and assumedly concerned with the welfare and the dynamics of the University, and staff members under the Office of Student Services toward aspects of collective bargaining at the Ohio State University, Columbia campus. Findings point out a variety of areas, such as fringe benefits, working conditions, and student participation that have the potential to become areas of conflict. In the event of collective bargaining at Ohio State, the question whether decisions will be made in the distributive model as a result of power, coercion, and formalization, or in the integrative model as a result of trust, reason, and shared goals will be partly dependent upon a change in the attitudes of the parties involved. Those parties must understand that they are not simply interest groups but that they constitute the University and share a variety of common goals and interests. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116572

Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service
1818 R Street, N.W. / Washington, D. C. 20009 / 202/387-3760

George Ward Angell
Director

Edward P. Kelley, Jr., Esq.
Assistant Director

RESEARCH SUMMARY #3
October 1975

FACULTY, STUDENT AND STAFF ATTITUDES TOWARD POTENTIAL COLLECTIVE BARGAINING ISSUES AT THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

by
Daniel J. Phelan*

Subtle changes are occurring in campus attitudes toward unionization of university professionals. Consequences may lead to an acceleration of faculty elections and collective bargaining. This paper should be of more than passing interest to faculty members, administrators, and union officials considering the future possibility of faculty unionization.

Edward P. Kelley, Jr.
Associate Director

George W. Angell
Director

* Mr. Phelan's paper is a summary of a master's thesis completed under the direction and approval of Professor Robert Silverman, The Ohio State University, Summer, 1975.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE006987

Sponsored by the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

INTRODUCTION

The trend toward faculty collective bargaining has the potential for actions and attitudes which will have a great impact on the university. The roles of administrators, faculty, and students may be fundamentally altered with the current emphasis on legalism, accountability, and use of adversary proceedings in higher education.

In September 1974, members of The Ohio State University chapter of the American Association of University Professors voted to pursue collective bargaining as a means to secure salary, perquisites, and working conditions which they considered to be inadequate. With the lowest average compensation of any university in the "Big Ten," as well as ranking ninth out of eleven among state-supported schools in Ohio in compensation, the faculty has perceived itself as needing more control and power as a means of obtaining greater economic consideration. Authorization cards calling for collective bargaining by the AAUP on behalf of the Ohio State University faculty were returned by 1192 faculty members by May 15, 1975. The Executive Committee of the AAUP felt such a response demonstrated sufficient faculty interest to make a formal request that the administration hold a collective bargaining election early in the 1975-1976 academic year.

This article will examine attitudes, at this point in the bargaining process, held by faculty, student services staff, and students toward potential collective bargaining issues. Economic concerns, fringe benefits, bargaining unit composition, adversary relations, extent of student participation, the strike and faculty professionalism are all elements of issues involved in collective bargaining which are of consequence to members of a university. Since attitudes concerning faculty unionization would have an impact on its rejection or acceptance and its subsequent implementation, this article analyzes the results of a study conducted to determine the level of agreement among faculty, student services staff, and students before major collective bargaining activities, such as a run-off election, take place.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to assess attitudes held by faculty, students who are active and assumedly concerned with the welfare and the dynamics of the University, and staff members under the Office of Student Services toward aspects of collective bargaining at The Ohio State University, Columbus campus.

Since there were few precedents to follow in instrument development of this type, the first step deemed necessary was to search the literature and list those issues related to the emergence of collective bargaining, professionalism, collective bargaining and students, adversary relationships, and possible outcomes of collective bargaining. The relevancy of the statements included was based on items appearing in numerous collective

bargaining agreements, issues raised in the literature, court decisions, and National Labor Relations Board decisions. A pilot study was conducted to ascertain whether or not items included in the instrument reasonably covered the issues relevant to collective bargaining in higher eudcation. The final instrument was a summated rating scale eliciting responses on an SA (Strongly Agree) to N (Neutral) to SD (Strongly Disagree) continuum.

THE POPULATION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES

Three samples were used to obtain data for the study. These samples were located at The Ohio State University, Columbus campus, and were as follows: (1) student representatives to University Committees, Boards, and Councils, (2) University faculty, and (3) members of the staff of the Vice President for Student Services.

The student sample consisted of fifty-one representatives from Undergraduate Student Government, twenty-seven students from the Council of Graduate Students, and seventeen students from the Inter-Professional Council. The sample for students totaled ninety-five subjects.

The student services staff population consisted of eighty-five subjects from various student personnel agencies and campuses.

The faculty population consisted of a stratified random sample of 120 faculty members selected from the Colleges of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, Biological Sciences, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, Law, Medicine, Engineering, Administrative Science and Agriculture.

SUBJECTS

Instruments suitable for use in the study were returned by 203 of the 300 persons sampled, which represented a 66.7 per cent rate of response. The overall response for the study is indicated in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Response Rate

	Number Sampled	Number of Respondents	Per Cent Returned
Faculty	120	56	47
Student Services	85	75	87
Students	95	72	76
	300	203	66.7

STATISTICAL PROCEDURE AND DATA ANALYSIS

The responses of the two hundred and three subjects to the items

were analyzed using analyses of variance.[1] One-way analyses of variance were performed to examine the effects of group membership upon the type of response.

THE ANALYSIS

The instrument contained 70 items which were analyzed according to their content classification for the purpose of analyzing the data, the levels of agreement on the instrument were assigned values from 1 to 5 with strongly agree equal to 1 and strongly disagree equal to 5.

REASONS FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Faculty, student services personnel, and students were in agreement with many of the statements which dealt with possible reasons for collective bargaining.* Collective bargaining is perceived to be a potentially effective means to bring about wage increases for faculty, who now receive the lowest average compensation in the "Big Ten." The analysis of the data supports the notion of Carr and Van Eyck (1973) that the external influence of government agencies has been one of the major reasons for faculty unionization. Retrenchment in higher education and the fact unionization has grown in instituions of higher education also seem to lend credibility for thrust toward collective bargaining at O.S.U.

The three groups did not agree that collective bargaining by faculty would reflect a failure of campus governance and there was not agreement with Tyler's (1972) notion that collective bargaining by faculty would be an attempt to create a more personal atmosphere in the university community. While there was a significant difference among groups over Carr and Van Eyck's (1973) proposal, that the legislature would be more responsive to a collective bargaining contract than to lobbying by the University administration, the three groups substantially agreed with this notion.

Thus the external influence of the state legislature, average faculty compensation being the lowest in the "Big Ten," the belief collective bargaining might bring increased economic security, and power inherent in a collective bargaining contract were all indicated as potential reasons for collective bargaining.

---

[1]For all analyses of variance the SOUPAC (Statistically Oriented Users Programming and Consulting) program was used since this program performs an ANOVA and allows for unequal numbers of subjects in each group. The probability level of significance for each F ratio was computed by this program.

*To readers who wish to see the tabular results of specific questions, ACBIS will send a set of tables upon request.

EMERGENCE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

An analysis of the findings suggests the possibility of the emergence of collective negotiations at O.S.U. Respondents tended to disagree with the statement that collective bargaining has no place at Ohio State. Ladd and Lipset (1973) pointed out the American Association of University Professors has been selected as a bargaining agent by most four-year state supported institutions. The findings of this study were consistent with the national trend since the subjects indicated, by a wide margin, that the AAUP is the organization that would best represent the faculty in collective bargaining. The possibility of collective bargaining occurring within one year was not supported. However, there was agreement that a contract will be signed within two years.

Administrators are believed to be opposed to collective bargaining. The expressed attitudes of the respondents are given credibility by the testimony of Harold Enarson, President of The Ohio State University, given before the Ohio General Assembly. Enarson (1975) stated:

> We simply cannot support the proposition that collective negotiations between a university and its faculty and other professional staff are in the best interests of people of Ohio. We have difficulty seeing how collective bargaining can function in academic institutions which are supported by state funds and limited charges to students...both sources which are determined by the general assembly (p.1).

The respondents indicated a belief that collective bargaining will become a reality within two years, that its introduction will receive opposition from University administrators, and that the AAUP would best represent the interests of the faculty.

BARGAINING UNIT DETERMINATION

Rosen (1973) suggested the status of department chairpersons was crucial to faculty and administration. The inclusion of the chairperson in a bargaining unit prevents him/her from enforcing the contract on behalf of the University administration. Enarson (1975) stated:

> A serious problem would develop, however, if legislation allowed persons at the supervisory level to join with a unit of professional level employees. The first line of supervisory authority over faculty is the departmental chairmen .... We urge that you not allow supervisors to elect whether or not they wish to be included as part of the general professional employee unit (p. 5).

The attitudes expressed by the subjects confirm Rosen's notion that faculty prefer the inclusion of departmental chairpersons in the bargaining unit.

The respondents were also in agreement that law and medical school faculty should be included in any potential units. The data do not allow one to determine if the professional school faculties would desire inclusion in a bargaining unit, or would seek to remain separate from other University faculty members as occurred in the case of Fordham University Law School. It is important to note only five of the thirty professional faculty members sampled returned a completed instrument. Whether this is indicative of a disinterest on the part of professional school faculty remains to be determined.

Faculty members who responded favored a more homogeneous bargaining unit than did student services staff or students. However, both faculty and students disagreed that non-teaching professionals, in the area of student services, should be included in a bargaining unit. This has significant implications since the AAUP has solicited the staff in the student services area by encouraging membership of staff in order to increase its ranks and hopefully recruit more supporters of collective bargaining. Student services staff were mailed authorization cards by the AAUP and were asked to return them to demonstrate support for collective bargaining. The data from this study, however, support Coe (1974) who suggested student personnel administrators might be excluded from bargaining units. These findings might intensify the distinctions, discussed by Belcher, Avery and Smith (1971) made between student personnel workers and other non-teaching or "non-academic" personnel and faculty.

FRINGE BENEFITS

An area of great disagreement between faculty, student services staff, and students was fringe benefits. The data suggest the area of fringe benefits is not where faculty might decide to make concessions. Free parking, tuition scholarships for dependents, maternity leave, improved medical fringe benefits, and a higher discount at the University bookstore are all items which the faculty agreed are their due.

Students opposed free parking, tuition scholarships for dependents, and higher bookstore discounts, and were neutral on medical and dental fringe benefits.

Student services staff were midpoint between faculty and students in terms of their mean reponses to these items, indicating their identity with the goals and needs of both faculty and students. The data support Shark (1974) who stated faculty fringe benefits could be detrimental to students' rights. Students were reluctant to approve of fringe benefits for faculty. This may be a result of the fact that students do not receive many of these fringe benefits or that students simply will not agree to support benefits for faculty at a time when tuition and fees are increasing. Their neutrality on the issues of medical and dental care might be explained by the fact that students have an excellent health insurance program available to them and their perceptions that an employee should be provided with adequate health care.

WORKING CONDITIONS

Race (1973) indicated the need of faculty members for a greater role in determining working conditions as one reason for the growth of collective bargaining. The findings of this study show a significant difference among groups in response to the statement comparing the economic status of faculty members to other professional groups. The difference between groups was one of degree rather than agreement, however. Both students and student services staff agreed with faculty that remuneration of faculty is not commensurate with that of other professional groups. Although there was agreement on the need for more office space and funds for teaching aids, the data do not suggest these issues are as crucial as the economic status of faculty. While students and student services staff were in agreement that a minimum faculty workload should be part of a collective bargaining agreement, faculty members were not supportive of such a provision.

Bonham (1972) questioned the legitimacy of tenure at an institution where the faculty had unionized. The data from this study suggest a potential area of conflict between faculty, student services staff, and students. The findings indicate disagreement by students and students services staff with the notion of the tenure system maintaining its traditional form if the faculty unionizes.

STUDENTS AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The attitudes expressed by the subjects reflect disagreement with the statement that faculty unionization will be viewed by students as a backlash to the power they attempted to gain in the 1960's.

Ladd and Lipset (1973) suggested that the faculty was not ready to relinquish its role in decision making, and prefer to limit student input to a strictly consultative role. The data from this study confirm their premise. While there was agreement that students are consumers of services offered by faculty, students and student services personnel agree more strongly with this item than do faculty. Faculty and student services personnel were not supportive of student participation in the University decision making process, nor were they in favor of an increased student role in University governance.

While students have attempted to secure additional representation on the University Senate during the 1974-1975 academic year, the attitudes of faculty sampled in this study do not suggest passage of students' proposal. Should students attempt to participate in a possible bargaining situation, faculty and student services staff might be prepared to thwart such an effort. This raises the possibility, as Coe (1974) has suggested, that faculty may be in a position to negotiate the parameters of student participation in governance. Both Coe (1974) and Finkin (1971) have stated such a development could decrease student participation should issues that were once decided in a student-faculty senate, now be negotiated at the bargaining table in the absence of students.

Finkin (1971) has suggested the legitimacy of these deliberative bodies, such as University Senate to which students have secured representation, might also be questioned by the bargaining agent.

Faculty and student services personnel agreed that participation by students in the faculty personnel process is inappropriate, the role of students in University governance should not be expanded, and it is of little consequence to them if the role of students in campus decision making was to be diminished.

An analysis of the study findings suggests faculty and student services personnel viewed student participation as minimally important, yet also might seek to prevent efforts by students to participate in the collective bargaining process, should negotiations occur.

FACULTY PROFESSIONALISM

Pitts (1972) suggested faculty members will have to deal with possible anxiety over a loss of prestige and status if they decide to unionize. In short, their professionalism may be questioned by themselves, as well as by other constituencies within an institution. However, the data indicated disagreement by faculty that their professional status would be diminished if they were required to report off-campus consultation, maintain a minimum number of office hours, or have the quality of their teaching be observed by their peers.

The data suggest that students and student services personnel did not agree that faculty unionization was unprofessional. The local chapter of the AAUP has lately encouraged membership by offering a "tire purchase deal" and an "automobile purchase plan" to members. It would appear from the data that faculty might perceive unionization as enhancing their professional status, rather than experiencing anxiety about their professionalism should they unionize.

ADVERSARY RELATIONS

Students and student services personnel did acknowledge collective bargaining has the potential to enable faculty to obtain greater economic security, fringe benefitss, more favorable working conditions, and might be used to limit legislative supervision of the University. There remain a number of areas, however, such as fringe benefits, student participation in governance and collective bargaining, and working conditions, which are potential areas of conflict among faculty, student services staff, and students. Finkin (1971) contended unionization might foster or increase the divisiveness between the various constituencies comprising the university. Enarson (1975) stated:

> We are deeply concerned by the prospect of an adversary relationship where hostility and conflict are a way of life and a clear threat to the capacity for learning on our campuses. Regrettably students are all too often

drawn into such emotional conflicts in ways that can only be disruptive and harmful to the entire educational process (p. 2).

The results of this study suggest the following areas as possibly leading to conflict which might serve to intensify adversarial relationships:

1) Faculty clearly have a preference for a homogeneous bargaining unit. While students agreed that a larger number of groups should be included, student services staff preferred the inclusion of all groups except graduate teaching and research assistants. Responses from student services indicated a desire to be included in the unit, however, the attitudes of faculty and students suggest the exclusion of student personnel workers.
2) Faculty members agreed they should receive all the fringe benefits contained in statements in the instrument. Students opposed faculty receiving any of the benefits, but were neutral on those dealing with medical care. Student services staff had an intermediate position to faculty and students.
3) Significant differences were found among the three groups on their attitudes toward working conditions. The data suggest students favor increased accountability of faculty workloads. While they agreed faculty should receive sabbatical leaves, their level of agreement was stronger for establishing minimum workloads. Student services personnel identify with faculty on a majority of the issues.
4) The role of students in the University decision making process and in collective bargaining is another potential area of conflict. Students indicated a preference for an expanded role in governance and to have equal bargaining power in collective negotiations. Faculty and student personnel workers were opposed to these kinds of student involvement.
5) While the faculty agreed the strike is a legitimate means for faculty to use, students were neutral on the issue, with student services personnel assuming an intermediate position.
6) Faculty agreed that a union representing them should have access to University resources. Student services personnel and especially students, while not in disagreement, were far less likely to agree than were faculty.
7) Faculty disagreed they should receive an increased workload in exchange for a salary increase above 14%. Students agreed with this notion.
8) Students agreed a salary increase for faculty of 14% is not justified if this would result in a decrease of University services.

Hedgepeth (1974) found adversary attitudes increased at State University College at Cortland after the faculty unionized. The data from this study suggest that faculty, student services personnel, and students agreed bargaining will create hostility, and expressed even stronger agreement that there is now a climate of hostility

between faculty, students, and administrators at The Ohio State University.

POTENTIAL OUTCOMES OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Begin (1974) pointed out an assumption is made that collective bargaining must result in a decrease in the effectiveness of university senates. He cites findings, however, which indicate this assumption is not always a necessary consequence of collective bargaining. When asked to respond to the statement that collective bargaining would not have a negative effect on the role of faculty and administration in decision making, students, faculty, and student personnel workers agreed that traditional forms of governance, such as University senate, are not incompatible with faculty unionization.

All three groups were in agreement that collective bargaining would prevent Ohio State University from receiving the lowest average compensation in the "Big Ten." Faculty sampled felt individual bargaining for salaries should remain in effect even if a collective bargaining contract was signed.

IMPLICATIONS

Faculty

The president of the local chapter of the AAUP suggested that an AAUP study of the possible ramifications of a collective bargaining agreement did not reveal any concessions the faculty would have to make to the administration. "The only concession I can foresee the faculty at Ohio State making is the right to work for substandard wages" (The Ohio State Lantern, October 29, 1974, p.3).

The results of this study would suggest faculty members tend to hold a similar attitude. Faculty agreed they should receive all fringe benefits, were opposed to the potential participation of students in the collective bargaining process, and agreed with those statements which suggest an expansion of favorable working conditions such as sabbatical leaves. Faculty viewed unionization as an effective means to gain wage increases and felt bargaining would raise their level of compensation in the "Big Ten."

Faculty members were indifferent or opposed to student participation in University governance, and expressed some of their strongest disagreement concerning the issue of student participation in bargaining. Despite the fact that a wage increase of over 14% could mean increased student fees and/or a decrease in University salaries, faculty agreed such an increase is still justifiable.

Student Services Personnel

Silverman (1971) suggested the role of the student personnel worker is becoming transformed into that of a mediator:

> More than ever before, he is explaining

> the assumptions of faculty, students, and administrators to each of these groups, is the spokesman for the university to confused community organizations, and attempts to make decisions that are in the best interests of the diverse campus community (p. 3).

In order to perform this mediating function, Silverman indicated that student personnel workers must have the respect of academic personnel, be perceived as having a legitimate function on campus, be competent in the area of negotiation, be able to work with various campus groups, and must be more concerned with professional than organizational accountability.

The student personnel workers sampled in this study are in what Silverman describes as an intermediate position between faculty and students on issues dealing with fringe benefits, a number of statements which dealt with working conditions, student participation, faculty professionalism, adversary relations, use of University resources, and potential outcomes of collective bargaining. Student personnel workers identified with faculty on issues such as receiving expenses to attend professional meetings and the undesirability of students having equal representation at the bargaining table. Their identification with interests and goals of students was also reflected by their similar levels of agreement on the issues of tenure and faculty being required to maintain minimum office hours. The data from this study confirm the notion expressed by Silverman (1971) that:

> ...student personnel workers hold by training and inclination, the norms of faculty (with emphasis on intellectual development), of administrators (with their stress on efficiency), and of students (with attention placed on individual growth). In a sense, personnel workers are peripherally related to the goals and values of the campus' diverse elements (p. 9).

While student personnel workers have been traditionally oriented toward their clients, students, this study suggests a deviation from that norm. Student personnel workers were neutral in their responses dealing with student participation in the faculty personnel decision process and the expansion of the role of students in University governance. Student personnel workers disagreed that, in the event of faculty unionization, students should seek independent bargaining through a student union or have equal bargaining power with faculty and administration. They were also neutral on the issue of students having observer status during negotiations. These findings do not suggest that student personnel workers, who Coe (1974) indicated have supported student participation in governance, will necessarily continue to be advocates of students in that area.

Student personnel workers were in agreement that they and other non-teaching professionals should be included in a University-wide

bargaining unit. While student personnel workers indicated a desire to participate in bargaining should it emerge at Ohio State, faculty and students were opposed to their inclusion in a bargaining unit. The perceived undesirability by faculty of student personnel workers in the bargaining unit suggests that the status of personnel workers is marginal, that they have not won the respect of faculty, and that faculty do not believe they share common goals and interests. Perhaps students oppose their inclusion because they see student personnel workers as allies who would support and defend the interests and rights of students.

Student personnel workers, by virtue of their intermediate position, could possibly be effective in preventing the establishment of a very cynical, win-lose climate between faculty and students. By emphasizing shared goals and trying to foster an attitude of trust, they could attempt to alleviate distortions in judgment and perceptions which tend to characterize adversary relations. In order to function effectively in a mediator role, student personnel workers cannot pursue a role of passivity. They probably should develop opportunities to point out shared interests, clarify demands of the participants and interpret the parties' needs to each other.

While literature supports the notion of personnel workers functioning in mediating role, and the findings of this research confirm their identity with the interests of faculty and students, the data also point out several areas which could prevent student personnel workers from assuming this role.

1) If student personnel workers unionize, in a unit with faculty or independently, students may perceive them as adversaries. This would limit the ability of personnel workers to mediate between faculty and students, especially if students perceive them as failing to defend their interests.
2) Since faculty oppose the inclusion of student personnel workers in a bargaining unit, this could suggest they do not perceive their functions as legitimate and/or do not feel they have the same goals and interests. This possible lack of respect would not strengthen student personnel workers' credibility in a mediating role.
3) Student personnel workers' own need for representation by a bargaining unit may be great enough to take precedence over their committment to students. Their own economic survival and existence on campus may become paramount.

Silverman's (1971) notion that student personnel workers identify with students, faculty, and administrators is also true in the context of collective bargaining. Student personnel workers, who possess marginal status in many institutions, hold the goals of faculty (who are attempting to obtain salary, working conditions, and a greater control over governance), administrators (who may indicate collective bargaining is not in the best interests of an institution and may further adversary relations), and students (who may lose much of what they gained, if they are excluded from participation in the bargaining process).

Students

> Get administrative positions; show them we're not animals kept by zookeepers. We can destroy patronizing attitudes. We must become decision-makers and not play the same games. (The Ohio State Lantern, February 12, 1975, p. 1).

This statement was made by a student at an Undergraduate Student Government rally which advocated increased representation of students on the University Senate. The data gathered in this study offer a number of insights into the attitudes of faculty, student personnel workers, and students at Ohio State, toward student participation in governance and their potential role in collective bargaining.

Hawes and Trux (1974) stated:

> The exercise of shared authority by faculty, administrators, students, and board members in a university government requires tolerance, respect and a sense of community which arises from participation in a common cause...Unmonitored authority, shared or unshared, because needs and desires of the repressed parties cannot be fulfilled (p. 124).

It is these same "needs and desires" of students which seem jeopardized by the attitudes expressed by faculty and student personnel workers. The data suggest students are far more student-oriented than are other groups. The mean responses indicate faculty disagreement on the propriety of student participation in faculty personnel processes and on the expansion of the role of students in governance. Student personnel workers were neutral on these issues. While students agreed they should be represented by a student union, and have equal representation in the event of collective bargaining, faculty and student personnel workers were opposed to these concepts.

Hawes and Trux (1974) stated:

> Students, both on and those not on committees, felt they were underrepresented, while most faculty felt student representation was adequate (p.128).

Perhaps the negative attitude toward student participation in governance and collective negotiations is not so much from an insensitivity to issues in faculty unionization which might have an effect on students, but rather a perception on the part of faculty and student personnel workers that student interests can be responded to only after their own needs in the form of adequate compensation, working conditions, and fringe benefits have been met.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

While problems in the areas of wages, working conditions,

and fringe benefits are critical to faculty at The Ohio State University, there remains the possibility that these areas will become issues rather than problems of the institution. Walton and McKersie (1965) make the distinction between distributive and integrative bargaining. "The joint-decision process for resolving conflicts of interest is distributive bargaining. The term itself refers to the activity of deciding limited resources. It occurs in situations in which one party wins what the other pary loses" (p. 11). Distributive bargaining involves issues while integrative bargaining concerns itself with problems about which all the participants in bargaining are concerned. "For an issue the interests of the two parties are diametrically opposed; for a problem the interests are identical or completely coincidental" (p. 127).

There is a need to develop new approaches to collective bargaining in higher education which encourage integrative bargaining. Walton and McKersie (1965) suggested a problem-solving model and this approach could be implemented prior to a run-off election. Before opinions are formed or actions taken concerning the bargaining question, this model might allow faculty, administrators students and trustees an opportunity to thoroughly examine the issues involved.

First the problem must be identified. Trust and support among the parties are essential conditions so an adequate exchange of information concerning problems perceived by each of the groups can occur. Representatives from faculty, administration, trustees, and students could be included to assess the implications of collective bargaining for each of these groups. Emphasis should be that the dominant mission of the university is to advocate education, in its broadest sense, and that no problem should be decided simply on the basis of which group has the most bargaining power.

Second, alternative solutions need to be considered and their consequences examined. The question of "would the Ohio legislature be more responsive to a collective bargaining contract than to lobbying by the University administration?" is key in determining the direction the faculty might pursue. Alternatives to unionization such as Goldman's (1972) "Militant Accreditation Model" based on the standards used by the American Association of Law Schools, the professional negotiating team concept, and the potential role of students in the bargaining process could be considered.

The third step in the model is to order the solutions based on the available alternatives and to choose a course of action.

An examination of the faculty collective bargaining issues with the use of this "open-ended" model has the potential to result in a decision-making process rather than an essentially political one. Walton and McKersie indicate the implications of their problem-solving model:

> The parties may go no farther than defining the problem, or they may define the problem and share information about some obvious alternatives but fail to engage in creative search for new alternatives. They may be effective in carrying out all the steps of the problem-solving model and as a result create considerable joint gain (p. 160).

The findings of this study point out a variety of areas such as fringe benefits, working conditions, and student participation that have the potential to become areas of conflict. In the event of collective bargaining at Ohio State, the question whether decisions will be made in the distributive model as a result of power, coercion, and formalization, or in the integrative model as a result of trust, reason, and shared goals will be partly dependent upon a change in the attitudes of the parties involved. It is essential that faculty, administrators, trustees, and students understand they are not simply interest groups lacking a committment to anything except the bargaining process, but that they constitute the University and share a variety of common goals and interests.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Begin, J. "Faculty Governance and Collective Bargaining: An Early Appraisal," The Journal of Higher Education, November, 1974, pp. 582-593.

Belcher, A.L., Avery, H.P., and Smith, O.S. Labor Relations in Higher Education. Washington: College and University Personnel Association.

Bonham, G. "The New Class," Change, Winter 1971-72, pp.13-14.

Carr, R.K. and Van Eyck, D.K. Collective Bargaining Comes to Campus, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1973.

Coe, A.C. "The Implications of Collective Bargaining for Student Personnel Administrators," NASPA Journal, October, 1973, pp. 9-18.

Enarson, H.L. "Testimony Before House-Senate Subcommittee of Commerce and Labor, Ohio General Assembly," April 16, 1975.

Finkin, M.W. "Collective Bargaining and University Government," AAUP Bulletin, January, 1971, pp. 149-162.

Goldman, G., Crowley, M., and Wirtz, L. "Faculty Collective Bargaining and the Law Schools -- A panel Discussion," Ohio State Law Journal, 33: 743, 1972.

Hawes, L.C. and Trux, H. "Student Participation in the University Decision-Making Process," The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 45, February 1974, pp. 123-134.

Hedgepeth, R.C. "Consequences of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education," The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 45, December, 1974, pp. 691-705.

Ladd, E.C. and Lipset, S.M. Professors, Unions and American Higher Education, 1973.

Pitts, J.R. "Strike at Oakland University," Change, February 1972, pp. 16-17.

Race, J. "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education," Texas Southern University Law Review, Vol. 2, Winter, 1973, pp. 281-300.

Rosen, L. "The Bargaining Unit Status of Academic Department Chairmen," University of Chicago Law Review, 40:422-459, Winter, 1973.

Shark, A. "A Student's Collective Thought on Bargaining," The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 43, October, 1972, pp. 552-558.

Silverman, R.J. "The Student Personnel Worker on the Boundary," The Journal of College Student Personnel, January 1971, pp. 3-6.

Walton, R.E. and McKersie, R.B. A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiation, McGraw-Hill Book Co: New York, 1965.